

Case Officer: George Smith

Applicant: Mrs Carol Black

Proposal: Change of Use from garage/workshop to two bedroom cottage - re-submission of 19/01670/F

Ward: Deddington

Councillors: Councillor Hugo Brown
Councillor Mike Kerford-Byrnes
Councillor Bryn Williams

Reason for Referral: Called in by Councillor Kerford-Byrnes on the grounds that a refusal of the permission would result in the removal of the animal welfare licence.

Expiry Date: 17 February 2020

Committee Date: 13 February 2020

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS AND RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION: REFUSE PERMISSION

Proposal

The applicant seeks planning consent for the change of use of a garage/workshop to two-bedroom cottage, which would be occupied in association with Portway Cattery.

Consultations

No consultee has raised **objections** to the application

The following consultees have raised **no objections** to the application:

- Somerton Parish Council, CDC Environmental Protection, OCC Highways, OCC Minerals and Waste

No letters of objection have been received and 1 letter of support have been received.

Planning Policy and Constraints

The application has also been assessed against the relevant policies in the NPPF, the adopted Local Plan and other relevant guidance as listed in detail at Section 8 of the report.

Conclusion

The key issues arising from the application details are:

- Principle of development
- Design, and impact on the character of the area
- Residential amenity
- Highway safety

The report looks into the key planning issues in detail, and Officers conclude that the proposal is unacceptable for the following reasons.

1. Unjustified housing development outside the built-up limits of any settlement, contrary to the development plan

2. Adverse visual harm to the open countryside

Members are advised that the above is a summary of the proposals and key issues contained in the main report below which provides full details of all consultation responses, planning policies, the Officer's assessment and recommendations, and Members are advised that this summary should be read in conjunction with the detailed report.

MAIN REPORT

1. APPLICATION SITE AND LOCALITY

- 1.1. The application relates to a commercial cattery, served by a two-storey detached dwelling with its detached garage/workshop. The dwelling is externally faced in cream painted render with a tiled roof facing south on to Ardley Road. Planning permission has been given for an existing garage to be converted into ancillary accommodation.
- 1.2. The cattery, occupied by Portway Cattery, has 41 total licensed chalets, with a maximum occupancy of up to 80 cats. The chalets and associated cattery buildings cover the majority of the eastern portion of the site.
- 1.3. There are two separate accesses into the site, one to serve the domestic dwelling (west) and one for customers to serve the cattery business (east). There are no changes in levels across the site that would significantly affect the application assessment. The site does not lie within the built form of any settlement, is not bounded by any residential properties and is surrounded by open countryside.

2. CONSTRAINTS

- 2.1. The application building is not listed, and the site is not within a designated Conservation Area.

3. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 3.1. The applicant seeks planning consent for a single residential dwelling in the ownership boundary of Portway Cottage. The new dwelling would be of the same size and scale of the approved garage/workshop building, whereby an extension was approved under reference: 16/01510/F; however, these works have not yet been completed.
- 3.2. The applicant states that the additional dwelling on site would be essential for the operation of the cattery business, as a full-time worker would therefore not be required to make daily trips to the site.

4. RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 4.1. following planning history is considered relevant to the current proposal:

<u>Application Ref.</u>	<u>Proposal</u>	<u>Decision</u>
CHS.280/92	Timber boarding cattery in paddock adjoining house	Application Permitted
01/00529/F	Remove old garage and replace with new on same base. Conservatory to rear of	Application Permitted

house

99/00626/F	Re-siting of existing isolation unit and construction of 15 chalets	Application Permitted
------------	---	-----------------------

This consent included a planning condition which restricted the occupation of the dwelling on the site solely to someone employed at the cattery.

06/00309/F	Erection of timber shop building	Application Refused
------------	----------------------------------	---------------------

06/01257/F	Erection of wooden storage building for pet supplies and pet supplies delivery business.	Application Permitted
------------	--	-----------------------

08/00144/F	Two storey rear and single storey side extensions	Application Permitted
------------	---	-----------------------

11/00075/F	Extension of time limit of 08/00144/F - Two storey rear and single storey side extensions	Application Permitted
------------	---	-----------------------

14/01069/F	Change of use from cattery to kennels with paddock for the exercise of dogs	Application Refused due to noise concerns
------------	---	---

16/01510/F	Workshop extension to existing garage	Application Permitted
------------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------

17/00492/F	Change of use from garage/workshop to two bedroom cottage	Application Withdrawn
------------	---	-----------------------

17/02336/F	Change of use from garage/workshop to two bed cottage - Re-submission of 17/00492/F	Application Refused and dismissed at appeal*
------------	---	--

*Appeal ref: APP/C3105/W/18/3200260 (application ref: 17/02336/F)

- 4.2. The Inspector considered that the main issues were the suitability of the location for new residential unit given its location in the countryside, and the effect on the character and appearance of the area.
- 4.3. The appellant suggested that the conversion of the building was required in order to meet an essential need for a rural worker to reside at the site. The appellant reasoned that an additional on-site presence was needed overnight in order to deal with occurrences that may arise. The Inspector considered that there had been no information submitted as to the frequency of such visits, or the impact on the

operation of the cattery business. Furthermore, the appellant referenced the benefits of having two trained persons when hand rearing kittens, with reference to the “kitten season”, but the Inspector noted that there was no reference to the frequency of such activities or whether two members of staff were required at all times of day for this activity, whilst adding that the mention of season suggests that this is a defined period of time within the year and not an all year round requirement.

- 4.4. Additionally, the inspector noted that the existing dwelling on site currently provides permanent residence, with no detailed evidence of the breakdown of activities on the site that would always require more than one person on site. It was also not demonstrated that other options had not been explored, such as additional overnight accommodation within the existing dwelling, having a night shift worker, or having a person on call when certain times arise. The Inspector therefore concluded that it was not demonstrated that there was an essential need for an additional dwelling at the site. The Inspector added that neither safety of boarding cats or continued viability of the business would be jeopardised by the lack of a further dwelling on the site.
- 4.5. By virtue of the introduction of a further residential unit into the countryside, resulting in the subdivision of the site, laying out of a garden and parking area and subsequent additional domestic paraphernalia, would result in a further intrusion into the countryside at this location. The Inspector therefore concluded that the location would not be a suitable location for a new residential unit, not according with Policies ESD1, ESD13, ESD15 and Villages 1 of the CLP (2031) and saved Policies H18, H19, C8, C28 and C30 of the CLP (1996).

5. PRE-APPLICATION DISCUSSIONS

- 5.1. No pre-application discussions have taken place with regard to this proposal.

6. RESPONSE TO PUBLICITY

- 6.1. This application has been publicised by way of a site notice displayed near the site and by letters sent to all properties immediately adjoining the application site that the Council has been able to identify from its records. The final date for comments was **12 December 2019**, although comments received after this date and before finalising this report have also been taken into account.
- 6.2. The comments raised by third parties are summarised as follows:
 - The business offers a much-needed service for the area and needs extra housing for staff accommodation to give the owner some relief. Current arrangement is not sustainable.
- 6.3. The comments received can be viewed in full on the Council’s website, via the online Planning Register.

7. RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION

- 7.1. Below is a summary of the consultation responses received at the time of writing this report. Responses are available to view in full on the Council’s website, via the online Planning Register.

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL AND NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUMS

- 7.2. SOMERTON PARISH COUNCIL: **No objections**

WARD MEMBERS

- 7.3. COUNCILLOR MIKE KERFORD-BYRNES: **Comments** – that the cattery has been granted a “5-star accreditation” by DEFRA, which indicates that the highest standard of care is provided to all pets in their charge, with one condition being that “*a competent person must be on site at all times*”. The Councillor notes that the accreditation was awarded on 19th December 2018, one month after the Planning Inspector’s decision.
- 7.4. The Councillor states that should an application be refused, the applicant must take a cat to the vet, leaving no “competent person” on site and as such would be in breach of the license. The Councillor notes the provision of NPPF Para 83, which has regard for the growth of rural businesses. The Councillor believes that a refusal to grant permission could result in the withdrawal of the licence, contrary to the aims of Para 83.

CONSULTEES

- 7.5. OCC HIGHWAYS: **No objections** subject to conditions for parking and manoeuvring areas to be retained and for cycle parking details to be submitted.
- 7.6. CDC ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION: **No objections** – subject to a condition for EV charging infrastructure.
- 7.7. CDC HEALTH PROTECTION: **comments** – see below:

*“Having reviewed the planning statement provided and compared this against the requirements detailed in the Guidance notes for Conditions for Providing Boarding for Cats (November 2018) (Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs), it is the officer’s opinion that the business would be able to meet the **required*** higher standard in terms of the provision of visiting the cats within the cattery at least once between the hours of 6pm and 8am. It is the officer’s understanding that this business operates to a standard which currently allows this.*

*The **required*** higher standards also state that a competent person must be on site at all times. However, the document does not specify what a ‘competent’ person is. This team would establish whether a person was ‘competent’ by discussing and questioning the individual on their understanding of how the business operates and how they ensure the welfare of the cats in their care. It is understood that the business is currently able to achieve this, although **allowances may be accepted in an emergency situation such as the competent person taking a cat to the vet during the ‘out of hours’ period and no other ‘competent’ person being available on site.***

[Whether a person trained at International Cat Care Standards is not a determinant of whether someone is ‘competent’ in its own right], but if the training covers health and welfare and means the person can identify normal behaviours and recognise signs of, and take measures to, mitigate or prevent pain, suffering, injury or disease and they apply that knowledge and they also understand how the business operates (e.g. their policies and procedures) then it is likely we would consider the individual to be ‘competent’. The cattery would need to ensure staff are competent and we would then discuss this during the inspection.

With regard to the business being able to respond to a fire it is the officer’s understanding that the designated key holder is within the specified 30 minutes

travelling time which is detailed in the Guidance Notes for Conditions document. However, for the welfare of the cats within the cattery it would of course be beneficial for more than one person to be on site to expediate the response time in an emergency situation.

Please be aware that to achieve a rating of 4 or 5 the cattery must achieve **ALL of the **required** higher standards detailed in the Guidance Notes for Conditions document and at least **50%** of the **optional** higher standards”.*

7.8. OCC MINERALS AND WASTE: **No objections**

8. RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY AND GUIDANCE

- 8.1. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 8.2. The Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 - Part 1 was formally adopted by Cherwell District Council on 20th July 2015 and provides the strategic planning policy framework for the District to 2031. The Local Plan 2011-2031 – Part 1 replaced a number of the ‘saved’ policies of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996 though many of its policies are retained and remain part of the development plan. The relevant planning policies of Cherwell District’s statutory Development Plan are set out below:

CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN 2011 - 2031 PART 1 (CLP 2031 Part 1)

- PSD1 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development
- BSC2 – Effective Use of Land and Housing Density
- ESD1 – Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change
- ESD3 – Sustainable Construction
- ESD7 – Sustainable Drainage Systems
- ESD10 – Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment
- ESD13 – Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement
- ESD15 – The Character of the Built and Historic Environment
- Villages 1 – Village Categorisation

CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN 1996 SAVED POLICIES (CLP 1996)

- H18 – New dwellings in the countryside
- H19 – Conversion of buildings in the countryside
- C8 – Sporadic development in the open countryside
- C28 – Layout and design of new development
- C30 – Design control

MID-CHERWELL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

- PD4: Protection of important views and vistas
- PD5: Building and Site Design
- PH6: Parking facilities for Existing Dwellings

8.3. Other Material Planning Considerations

- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
- Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

- The Animal Welfare (Licensing of Activities Involving Animals) (England) Regulations 2018
- The Animal Welfare (Licensing of Activities Involving Animals) (England) Regulations 2018: Guidance notes for conditions for providing boarding for cats (November 2018)

9. APPRAISAL

9.1. The key issues for consideration in this case are:

- Principle of development
- Design, and impact on the character of the area
- Residential amenity
- Highway safety

Principle of development

Policy context

- 9.2. The application site is not located within any settlement and falls some distance from the built-up limits of any settlement.
- 9.3. Policy ESD 1 of the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 outlines the measures to mitigate the impact of development within the district on climate changes and states this will include distributing growth to the most sustainable locations as defined in the local plan and delivering development which seeks to reduce the need to travel and help to reduce dependence on private cars. Saved Policy H18 of the Local Plan states planning permission will only be granted for the construction of new dwellings beyond the built up limits of settlements when they are essential for agriculture or are rural exception sites and would not conflict with other policies of the local plan, whereas Saved Policy H19 states conversions of rural buildings, intended to encourage the conversion of buildings not of modern construction but of traditional farm buildings. Policy C8 also seeks to prevent sporadic development in the countryside. These policies have been found to be broadly consistent with NPPF at appeal (planning ref: 12/01271/F).
- 9.4. Of relevance in this application are paragraph 170 of the NPPF which seeks to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, paragraph 79 which seeks to avoid new isolated homes in the countryside and the broad objectives of the NPPF which seek to direct development to the most sustainable and accessible locations.
- 9.5. Furthermore, Paragraph 83 of the NPPF encourages the sustainable growth and expansion of rural businesses in support of a prosperous rural economy. This policy supports well-designed new buildings where appropriate to support rural enterprises but does not have regard for new homes in the countryside. Paragraph 79 of the NPPF is most relevant in this case, which states that planning policies and decisions should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside, unless certain circumstances apply, including where there is an essential need for a rural worker, including those taking majority control over a farming business, to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside. The PPG includes guidance on what can be considered a material planning consideration, i.e. that planning is concerned with land use in the public interest, so that the protection of purely private interests are not material considerations (PPG Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 21b-008-20140306). Further it is important to emphasise that it is the requirements of the business which are relevant to the consideration of such proposals, and not the aspiration or preference of the applicant.

- 9.6. The applicant suggests that a new dwelling in this location would be in accordance with Saved Policy H19, being a conversion of a rural building. Application ref: 16/01510/F allowed the extension of the garage building to also include a workshop area. It is noted that development has commenced i.e. foundations have been laid, but that this work has not been continued with at this time. The Inspector in his determination of the appeal clarifies that this policy relates to buildings not of modern construction, but to traditional farm buildings. So, whilst the LPA had considered saved Policy H19 was not relevant, the Inspector determined that it did not provide support for the proposal.
- 9.7. The applicant has therefore submitted a case that the new dwelling is required to meet an 'essential need' to comply with saved Policy H18, seeking to address a lack of detail in relation to the nature of the business that the previous application did not submit. The application now seeks to address that lack of detail in the form of a planning statement (Roche Planning – dated August 2019).

Appraisal

- 9.8. Within the planning statement, the applicant raises the Animal Welfare Regulations 2018 as a material consideration, whereby licenses are granted by the relevant local authority. In the case of the Cherwell District, Health Protection Officers granted the relevant licence for catteries.
- 9.9. To qualify as meeting the higher standards (i.e. 4- or 5-star ratings), the business needs to achieve all the required higher standards as well as a minimum of 50% of the optional higher standards. During an inspection, the council inspector should assess whether the business meets the required number of higher standards. An animal welfare licence (reference: ANM0004) was granted on 19th December 2018 at Portway Cattery with a 5-star rating, which commenced on 1st January 2019 and will be in force until 31st December 2021, at which time a further inspection and assessment will take place.
- 9.10. The rationale behind the proposal is to create additional accommodation for the applicant's daughter and her family, who is a joint licence holder of the Portway Cattery and a full-time worker of said business, but currently commutes from Bicester (approx. 15-minute drive). To avoid the creation of new isolated dwellings in the countryside, this should either be accommodated as an extension to the existing dwelling or in annex accommodation, and there should remain a degree of physical and functional dependence between the main dwelling and the annex accommodation to mean the development would not result in the creation of an additional new dwelling. The proposed dwelling would contain a kitchen, lounge, utility room, WC, bathroom and 3 bedrooms (the 3rd bedroom indicated as a study on the plans). There would be no reliance from this new dwelling on any amenities within Portway Cottage and it could operate wholly independent from such.
- 9.11. This inspection and further assessment carried out by the Council's Health Protection department determined that the current arrangements at the site are suitable to meet this higher threshold i.e. that the existing dwelling on site, and the existing staffing living arrangements, can fulfil the needs and requirements of the business to be operational in the present and future.
- 9.12. The Health Protection Officers were aware of the circumstances involving the applicant's daughter being the joint license holder of the cattery and living off-site in Bicester (approx. 15-minute drive). They were aware that, in certain emergency situations, one license holder would be called out off-site at short notice and there may be no "competent person" on site at this time. This is emphasised by the Health Protection comments, which state "*allowances may be accepted in an emergency*"

situation such as the competent person taking a cat to the vet during the 'out of hours' period and no other 'competent' person being available on site". The animal welfare licence was granted on that basis and has been in force for 13 months.

- 9.13. Officers also note that, within the Animal Welfare Act 2018 regulations, there is no *requirement* for even 1 dwelling to be located on site. It is not considered that the applicant has justified that the existing dwelling (Portway Cottage) is no longer suitable to support the cattery business and it is noted that this dwelling is tied to the cattery business by virtue of earlier conditions. Even were the applicant to be able to demonstrate there was an essential need for somebody to be present at the site it is considered that this existing dwelling meets this essential need given the close and functional relationship of Portway Cottage, and in reality what is proposed here is a second dwelling to support the business.
- 9.14. The Inspector, in assessing the previous application on site (17/02366/F; appeal ref: APP/C3105/W/18/3200260), stated "*I consider that it has not been demonstrated that other options have been explored, such as creating additional overnight accommodation within the dwelling to cater for those occasions when the main occupant of the dwelling may need to be away from the site, or employing a person on a night shift basis and having a person on call to deal with issues that may arise*".
- 9.15. The applicant has submitted information that the current circumstances of the running of the business, i.e. applicant living on site, partner works elsewhere, and daughter lives off-site, do not allow for enough overnight cover. However, this is purely a personal circumstance and would not dictate the future running of the operation should the current owners cease to operate the premises. The applicant has submitted yearly accounts for 2017, 2018 and 2019 which demonstrate that the profitability of the business is growing, and Officers consider that the profits of the business would permit the appointment of an overnight member of staff if required.
- 9.16. Notwithstanding, in order for the principle of the proposed dwelling to be acceptable, there must be a clearly established functional need for a worker to be resident at the site, that need must relate to a full-time not a part-time requirement and it must be demonstrated that the functional need can only be met by the proposed dwelling.
- 9.17. In this instance, the applicant has not demonstrated that there is an essential need. The planning statement notes that there is a 'preference' for a second dwelling but stops short of making any argument that it is essential; nothing has been provided in the current submission to counter the Planning Inspector's finding that the need relates to a part-time requirement; and it has not been demonstrated that the functional need could not be met satisfactorily by another dwelling elsewhere.

Conclusion

- 9.18. Therefore, Officers conclude that the essential need for an additional dwelling has not been demonstrated. Rather, the 'need' is purely a personal desire of the applicant based on the personal circumstances put forward, would aid the running of the business but is by no means essential, and therefore does not meet the tests of saved Policy H18 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996, is not supported by Paragraphs 79 or 83 of the NPPF or by relevant policies within the CLP 2031 which seek to direct new housing growth towards the most sustainable towns and settlements.

Design and impact on the character of the area

- 9.19. Saved Policy C8 of the Local Plan 1995 seeks to protect the open countryside from sporadic development to maintain its attractive, open and rural character. Policy ESD 13 of the Local Plan seeks to protect the local landscape and states that

proposals will not be permitted where they would cause undue visual intrusion into the open countryside.

- 9.20. Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 states new development will be expected to complement and enhance the character of its context through sensitive siting and layout and states all development will be required to meet high design standards. It goes on to state development should respect the traditional form, scale and massing of buildings. Saved Policy C28 of the Local Plan also states the design and external material should be sympathetic to the character of the rural context. The NPPF also seeks to ensure high quality development and paragraph 58 and 60 states development proposals should respond to the local character and surroundings and reinforce local distinctiveness. Paragraph 64 states development should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area.
- 9.21. In the current application the proposed development would replace the existing garage building to the front of the site, matching the footprint of the approved garage and extension, but it is noted that the extension works have commenced but not been completed. However, on this basis, there is not considered any objection to the size and scale of the proposed building.
- 9.22. The proposal would change the character and appearance of the building from a domestic outbuilding to a new dwelling. It would introduce a number of new domestic features such as, a number of windows, rooflights and a flue. It is considered that these features, alongside the introduction of further domestic paraphernalia, an increased parking area and activity associated with a further dwelling, would cause further visual harm to the countryside, which would be clearly visible from the public bridleway which runs to the north of the site, and the adjacent road.
- 9.23. This concern raised by Officers was confirmed by the Planning Inspector in his assessment of application 17/02336/F (appeal ref: APP/C3105/W/18/3200260). The Inspector stated that the proposal would result in a subdivision of the site, and consequently the layout of garden and parking areas, containing additional domestic paraphernalia, would result in further intrusion into the countryside in this location.
- 9.24. Overall, it is considered that the proposed development, by virtue of introducing a further dwelling in an otherwise countryside setting and the introduction of associated domestic paraphernalia and division of the site, would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to saved policies H18, C8, C28 and C30 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996, policies ESD13 and ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 2031 Part 1 and relevant paragraphs of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Residential amenity

- 9.25. Both the NPPF and Policy ESD15 of the Local Plan seek to ensure new development proposals provide a good standard of amenity for both existing and proposed occupants of land and building.
- 9.26. The dwelling would be near Portway Cottage. Given their proposed relationship and proximity, however, I do not consider that there would be any material impact by way of loss of privacy. The LPA has previously approved a building of this scale in this location and the new dwelling is small in scale. Therefore, there would also be no harm caused by way of loss of light, outlook or over-domination.

Highway safety

- 9.27. Policy ESD15 of the CLP 2031 Part 1 states, amongst other matters, that new development proposals should: *be designed to deliver high quality safe...places to live and work in*. This is consistent with Paragraph 110 of the NPPF which states that: developments should create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.
- 9.28. The Local Highways Authority has not raised any objections to the proposal, subject to conditions for cycle parking and the vehicular parking shown to be implemented and retained. Whilst Officers see no reason to disagree with this assessment in relation to highway safety and parking provision, the introduction of the parking area shown would cause harm in respect of the character of the countryside as outlined in the above section.
- 9.29. Overall, the proposal is considered acceptable with regard to highway safety matters, compliant with Policy ESD15 and the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of this consideration.

10. PLANNING BALANCE AND CONCLUSION

- 10.1. The existing dwelling on site already serves Portway Cattery and is tied to this business by way of planning condition. The proposed development would result in a new, second dwelling for which it has not been demonstrated is essential to the running of the cattery business. There has been no business need demonstrated, but rather it is personal circumstances of the applicant and family being the reason for a further permanent dwelling to be sought. The proposal would therefore result in a new dwelling in an unsustainable isolated location remote from facilities and services, where future residents would have no realistic choice of alternative means of transport other than the private car. The proposal therefore conflicts with the Council's rural housing strategy outlined in Policy ESD1 and Policy Villages 1 of the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 (2015), Saved Policy H18 of the 1996 Local Plan and government advice in the NPPF which seeks to guide development in the most sustainable manner.
- 10.2. The proposed building and the introduction of domestic features and paraphernalia would also result in a visual intrusion into the open countryside and would detrimentally impact on the rural and appearance character of the site. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to saved policies C8, C28 and C30 of the Cherwell Local Plan (1996), policies ESD13 and ESD 15 of the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 (2015) and advice in the NPPF.

11. RECOMMENDATION

RECOMMENDATION - REFUSAL FOR THE REASONS SET OUT BELOW

1. The proposed dwelling constitutes unsustainable residential development in the countryside beyond the built-up limits, remote from services and facilities, without adequate justification that the new dwelling would be essential to the operations of the cattery business. The proposal therefore conflicts with the Council's rural housing strategy outlined in Policy ESD1 and Policy Villages 1 of the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 and Saved Policy H18 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular paragraph 79.
2. The proposed development, by virtue of its appearance and introduction of a further residential dwelling in the open countryside, would have a detrimental impact on the rural character and appearance of the area. The proposed development is therefore contrary to saved policies C8, C28 and C30 of the

Cherwell Local Plan (1996), policies ESD13 and ESD 15 of the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 (2015) and Government guidance contained within in the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular chapter 12.

CASE OFFICER: George Smith

TEL: 01295 221899